



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/050,768	01/16/2002	Shen-Chun Kuo	CD01352	7782
24265	7590	12/05/2003	EXAMINER	
SCHERING-PLOUGH CORPORATION PATENT DEPARTMENT (K-6-1, 1990) 2000 GALLOPING HILL ROAD KENILWORTH, NJ 07033-0530			BALASUBRAMANIAN, VENKATARAMAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1624	

DATE MAILED: 12/05/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No. 10/050,768	Applicant(s) KUO, SHEN-CHUN	
	Examiner Venkataraman Balasubramanian	Art Unit 1624	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 19 November 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☒ A Notice of Appeal was filed on 11/19/2003. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: _____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☒ Other: See attached Advisory Action

DETAILED ACTION

The response filed 11/19/2003 under 37 CFR 1.116 in reply to the final rejection has been considered but is not deemed to place the application in condition for allowance and will not be entered for the following reasons.

The following two 112 first paragraph rejections remain for reasons of record.

1. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for $\text{Bu}_4\text{I}/\text{H}_5\text{IO}_6$ as oxidizing/cyclizing agent, does not reasonably provide enablement for any or all oxidizing/cyclizing agent generically embraced in the claim language. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.
2. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for Bu_4I as soluble iodide, does not reasonably provide enablement for any or all iodide generically embraced in the claim language. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Applicants' traversal to overcome these two rejections is not persuasive. Contrary to applicants urging, these are process claims and mere recitation that "oxidation/cyclization agent" is not sufficient for the enablement requirement. There is no evidence in the specification or in the prior art that any or all oxidation/cyclization can

Art Unit: 1624

be used for the said reaction. Without any guidance in the specification, one trained in the art had to conceive and experiment to arrive at a suitable oxidation/cyclization agent. The same applies to the second rejection. Without any guidance, one trained in the art has to identify which iodide would work which would not by experimentation.

In both cases the finding would be not applicants' teaching.

Hence these rejections are proper and are maintained.

If the amendment were entered, the 112 second paragraph rejection of claims 1-28, 102 rejection of claims 10, 13-15 and objection to claims 16-24 would have be deemed as obviated.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be addressed to Venkataraman Balasubramanian (Bala) whose telephone number is (703) 305-1674. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8.00 AM to 6.00 PM. The Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) of the art unit 1624 is Mukund Shah whose telephone number is (703) 308-4716. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned (703) 308-4556. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

V. Balasubramanian
Venkataraman Balasubramanian

12/02/2003